

**REMARKS**

The office action mailed April 2, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicants herein amend claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-27, 29, 32 and 34-47. Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 28, 30, 31 and 33 are canceled. Claim 48 is withdrawn. New claims 49-52 are added. No new matter is introduced.

The office action objected to claims 1-3, 5, 9, 14, 20, 24-27, 29, 33, 38, 40 and 44 because of various informalities. Applicants believe that these objections are addressed and/or rendered moot by the amendments presented herein.

The office action rejected claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on a purported lack of clarity in independent claims 1 and 25. Applicants believe that the amendments to claims 1 and 25 render moot this ground for rejection.

The office action rejected claims 1, 2, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0041136 (Cheline et al., hereinafter "Cheline"). The office action rejected claims 3-24 and 27-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Cheline in various combinations with one or more of U.S. Patent 7,028,333 (Tuomenoksa et al.), U.S. Patent 7,100,046 (Balaz et al.), U.S. Patent 6,853,988 (Dickinson et al.), U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0203593 (Whelan et al.), U.S. Patent 7,114,126 (Berger et al.), U.S. Patent 7,113,983 (Terada et al.), U.S. Patent 6,233,618 (Shannon), U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0140257 (Peterka et al.), U.S. Patent 7,103,915 (Redlich et al.), U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0152299 (Traversat et al.) and U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0126085 (Srinivasan et al.). Applicants herein amend claim 1 to recite steps of

(b) receiving, in [a] wireless device and using [a connection via a publicly accessible network], information for provisioning [an automatic content updating (ACU)] program;

(c) provisioning the ACU program based upon the information received in step (b);

(d) receiving in the wireless device, via the publicly accessible network and using the provisioned ACU program, information for provisioning [a virtual private network (VPN)] program; [and]

(e) provisioning the VPN program based upon the information received in step (d)...

Even if the teachings of Cheline would properly have been combined with teachings from any of the other references relied upon in the office action, the above features are not taught or suggested.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable. Claims 2-24 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 25 has been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1, and is also believed allowable. Claims 26-28 depend from claim 25 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25. New claims 49-52 depend from one of claims 1 or 25.

All rejections having been fully addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /H. Wayne Porter/  
H. Wayne Porter  
Registration No. 42,084

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
(202) 824-3000

Dated: August 24, 2007

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants do not concede that Cheline would properly have been combined with any of the other cited references, or that any other combination of the cited references would have been proper. This point is now believed moot, however, and thus not further addressed.